

**REMARK/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-22 are presently active; Claims 1 and 8-22 having been amended by the present amendment.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 15-18 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al (U.S. Patent 5,579,055) and Klosterman (U.S. Patent 5,940,073), hereinafter referred to as Klosterman '073, in view of Klosterman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,576) and Terasawa et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,147,714). Claims 11-14 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548) in view of Terasawa et al.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection, the present amendment clarifies that the electronic program guide EPG data is altered (or added), according to the predetermined information generated at the transmitting end, such that the EPG displays, with preference and within a row of the display that includes at least the provider tag and a program name, the provider tag of the first broadcasting station among a plurality of broadcasting stations. These changes are supported by our discussions of Figure 1 and the written description on pages 7-8 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that the claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as agreed to by Examiner Koenig during discussions on March 30, 2005 when a request for submission of this supplemental amendment was made.

Klosterman '073 is cited in the outstanding Office Action for its teaching of promoting a program on a channel (in this case promoting NBC). However, in Klosterman '073, it is not NBC (the initial provider of the image signal) but rather the service provider

Application Serial No: 09/114,352  
Supplemental Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.114

that promotes NBC on the EPG information. For example, Klosterman '073 teach that the distribution center 110 and the service provider 140 (see col. 4, lines 28-62) or the satellite 115 in the event of atmospheric interferences (see col. 5, lines 31-47), and *not NBC*, provide the EPG data. Indeed, Klosterman '073 teach at col. 6, lines 35-37, that the system operator may charge television program providers (i.e., NBC) an additional fee for promoting and featuring programs in the information region.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the independent Claims 1 and 8-22, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably define over the applied prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Registration No. 40,073  
Attorney of Record  
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618

CUSTOMER NUMBER

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413-2220

BDL:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\203593US\SUPPL-AM.DOC